

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-6, 9-21 and 34-50 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Claims 1 and 9 are amended, Claims 22-33 are canceled as being drawn to a non-elected invention, and Claims 34-50 are added. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that the Office action indicates that Claims 2, 3 10, 11 and 13-15 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112 as set forth in the Office action. For the reasons set forth below, it is respectfully submitted that the remaining claims also contain allowable subject matter.

**1. The Claims Satisfy the Requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph**

The Office action rejects Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph asserting that Claims 1 and 7-9 are confusing. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

By this Amendment, Claim 1 is amended to more clearly define that the drive system moves a piece to be coated along the leveled table, that the piece to be coated is fed into one or more extrusion chambers, and that the feeding pump provides coating material to the one or more extrusion chambers.

It is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In addition, Claims 7-9 are canceled, thereby rendering the rejection moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**2. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

The Office action rejects Claims 1, 7 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Prince et al., Claims 1, 6, 7 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Rao et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,206,965) in view of Kertscher, Claims 4, 5, 8, 9, 17, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Rao et al in view of Kertscher and Santarossa, and Claims 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Rao et al. in view of Kertscher, Santarossa and Badger. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

By this Amendment, independent Claim 1 is amended to substantially incorporate dependent Claim 2, indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

For at least this reason, Claim 1 is allowable over the applied art, taken singly or in combination. Claims 3-21, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, are likewise allowable

Serial No. 10/676,693 Attorney Docket No. 209406-81686  
(Response to Restriction Requirement—page 7 of 8)

over the applied art, taken singly or in combination. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New independent Claim 34 substantially incorporates independent Claim 1 and dependent Claim 3, indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

For at least this reason, Claim 34 is allowable over the applied art, taken singly or in combination. Claims 35-53, which ultimately depend from Claim 34, are likewise allowable over the applied art, taken singly or in combination.

3. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.

Should Examiner Lamb believe anything further would be desirable in order to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

It is believed that any additional fees due with respect to this paper have already been identified. However, if any additional fees are required in connection with the filing of this paper, permission is given to charge account number 50-3145 in the name of Honigman Miller Schwartz and Cohn LLP.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 11, 2005

Customer No. 44200

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER  
Peter J. Rashid, Registration No.: 39,464  
Attorney for Applicant

HONIGMAN MILLER SCHWARTZ AND  
COHN LLP  
32270 Telegraph Road  
Suite 225  
Bingham Farms, Michigan 48025-2457  
(248) 566-8508

OAKLAND.958899.1

Serial No. 10/676,693 Attorney Docket No. 209406-81686  
(Response to Restriction Requirement—page 8 of 8)